



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,210	06/01/2006	Kenichiro Ota	062485	3740
38834	7590	02/06/2008	EXAMINER	
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP			KHOSRAVIANI, ARMAN	
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW				
SUITE 700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			2818	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/06/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/581,210	OTA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ARMAN KHOSRAVIANI	2818

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,4,5 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 5 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: the metal oxynitride electrode catalyst, wherein atomic ratio of (transition metal element):(oxygen):(nitrogen) is $(1\pm0.1):(1\pm0.1):(1\pm0.1)$. Either the metal oxynitride electrode catalyst is missing a structural relationship that is further limited by the atomic ratio or only a limitation of atomic ratio is sought.
3. Claims 4-5 recites the limitation "the reversible hydrogen electrode potential in the acidic electrolyte" in the use of the metal oxynitride electrode catalyst. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 1 does not disclose a reversible hydrogen electrode potential or the acidic electrolyte.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Deng et al. (US 5,980,977).

Regarding claim 1, Deng teach (col. 12/48 through col. 13/l. 3) a metal oxynitride electrode catalyst (col. 7/ll. 56-67) comprising an oxynitride containing at least one transition metal element selected from the group consisting of La, Ta, Nb, Ti, and Zr, the metal oxynitride electrode catalyst, wherein atomic ratio of (transition metal element):(oxygen):(nitrogen) is (1±0.1):(1±0.1):(1±0.1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in **Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966)**, that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows: (See ***MPEP Ch. 2141***)

- a. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art;
- b. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue;
- c. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and
- d. Evaluating evidence of secondary considerations for indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made

in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 2 and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deng et al. (US 5,980,977) in view of Clerc et al. (US 6,190,802).

Regarding claim 2, Deng fails to teach the metal oxynitride electrode catalyst above, wherein the metal oxynitride electrode catalyst is dispersed as fine particles on a catalyst carrier which is an electronically conductive powder.

4. However, Clerc disclose (col. 2/lls. 54-67, and col. 3/lls. 1-41) the metal oxynitride electrode catalyst (col. 3/ll. 23-41) , wherein the metal oxynitride electrode catalyst (dopants) is dispersed as fine particles on a catalyst carrier which is an electronically conductive powder (col. 3/ll. 23-41).

Since both Clerc and Deng teach the metal oxynitride electrode catalyst above, it would have been obvious to have the metal oxynitride electrode catalyst above, wherein the metal oxynitride electrode catalyst (dopants) is dispersed as fine particles on a catalyst carrier which is an electronically conductive powder of Clerc in Deng for the benefit of increasing the electrical conductivity of the device (col. 3/ll. 23-30).

Regarding claim 4, Clerc disclose (col. 6/lls. 14-30 and col. 7/lls. 11-23) the metal oxynitride electrode catalyst is an electrode catalyst for fuel cells (e.g. lithium battery cells).

The limitation "the metal oxynitride electrode catalyst above being used at a potential of 0.4 V or higher relative to the reversible hydrogen electrode potential in the acidic electrolyte." Is merely functional/intended us limitations that do not structurally

distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Moreover, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

Therefore, the phrase "used at a potential of 0.4 V or higher relative to the reversible hydrogen electrode potential in the acidic electrolyte" is thus non-limiting.

Regarding claim 5, Clerc disclose (col. 6/lls. 14-30 and col. 7/lls. 11-23) the metal oxynitride electrode catalyst is an electrode catalyst in an electrolytic apparatus (e.g. lithium battery cells).

The limitation "the metal oxynitride electrode catalyst above being used at a potential of 0.4 V or higher relative to the reversible hydrogen electrode potential in the acidic electrolyte." Is merely functional/intended us limitations that do not structurally distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re*

Otto, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Moreover, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

Therefore, the phrase "used at a potential of 0.4 V or higher relative to the reversible hydrogen electrode potential in the acidic electrolyte" is thus non-limiting.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2 and 4-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ARMAN KHOSRAVIANI whose telephone number is (571)272-2554. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 7:30a - 5:00p (Eastern Time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Loke can be reached on 571-272-1657. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AK

STEVEN LOKE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

